**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

**C.R.No. 6607 of 2006**
**Date of decision : 11.12.2006.**

Secretary ( Post & Telegraph Department ), Ministry of Communication, government of India, New Delhi and Ors.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

Daulat Ram Satija

.....Respondent.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD K. SHARMA**

Present : Mr.Namit Kumar,Advocate
for the petitioners.

****

**VINOD K. SHARMA,J.( ORAL )**

The present revision petition has been filed against the order passed by the learned Appellate Authority ordering the ejectment of the petitioners on the ground of personal necessity of the landlord.

The learned Appellate Authority has held the need to be bona fide on the ground, the statement of landlord to the effect that the shop was required to be demolished and reconstructed for settlement of the jobless son Kulbhushan Satija went unrebutted and, therefore, had to be believed. In view of this, it was held that the need of the respondent landlord was bona fide.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the landlord did not give the qualification of his son and the business he wanted to start and, therefore, it had to be held that the need was not bona fide.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and find no force in the same, the landlord is not required to disclose the business he wants to set up in the premises which was sought to be got vacated on the ground of personal necessity. Once his statement went unchallenged regarding his need, the Appellate Authority was bound to accept the same, which has rightly done.

No ground for interference.

Dismissed.

11.12.2006 **( VINOD K. SHARMA )**
**'sp'** **JUDGE**